



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,303	07/26/2006	Katsuhiro Takenaga	Q96164	6535
23373 7590 07/02/2009 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
PAJOCHI, TARA S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2886				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/587,303

Applicant(s)

TAKENAGA ET AL.

Examiner

Tara S. Pajooi

Art Unit

2886

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/26/06, 9/25/06 & 3/6/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. Acknowledgment is made to the amendment filed on 3/25/2009.
2. Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 7/26/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. However it appears that the translation for two of the non-patent literature documents have been provided in the IDS filed 9/25/2006. Also, the DiGiovanni reference has been corrected to identify the proper publication number.
4. The information disclosure statement filed 9/25/2006 fails to comply because it does not include all of the pertinent information relating to the non-patent literature documents, such as: dates, volume-issue number(s), publisher, city, and or/country where published, etc.
5. Acknowledgement is made that the information disclosure statement filed 3/6/2009 has been received and considered by the examiner. If the applicant is aware of any prior art or any other co-pending applications not already of record, he/she is reminded of his/her duty under 37 CFR 1.56 to disclose the same.

Specification

6. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
7. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

8. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 10 and 11 been renumbered to claims 9 and 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
10. **Claims 1-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ohira et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0228103)** in view of **Kahn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,155)**.
11. Considering claim 1, Ohira discloses (paragraphs 36-58) a method of measuring a differential mode delay of an optical fiber (i.e., differential group delay of the fiber), comprising: monitoring a

temperature ($T_1(x)$) of the optical fiber (8), during a measurement time of the DMD of the optical fiber, measuring a change in temperature of the optical fiber during the measurement time (i.e., measuring the shift in temperature), and controlling the temperature of the optical fiber such that an absolute value of the change of temperature of the optical fiber is maintained within a predetermined range during the measurement time (i.e., controlling the shift in temperature to be smaller than 2.5°C , paragraph 55).

Ohira fails to specifically disclose the multimode fiber.

However, Kahn discloses (col. 1, lines 20-40) it is well known to test multimode optical fibers.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to test multimode optical fibers as taught by Kahn in the method of Ohira, since Kahn discloses that multimode fibers are favored with respect to single mode fibers since they are of low cost of fiber installation, fiber maintenance and transceiver components (col. 1, lines 20-40).

12. Considering **claims 2 and 3**, the modified method of Ohira discloses (paragraphs 45-55) the temperature change of ($\pm 2.5^{\circ}\text{C}$) during the measurement of the DMB of the optical fiber is based upon a set time but fails to specifically disclose the predetermined range is calculated such that a product of the measurement time and a rate of temperature change during the measurement of the DMB of the optical fiber is 0.4°C or less (0.3°C or less, claim 3).

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the product of the measurement time and a rate of temperature change during the measurement of the DMB of the optical fiber is 0.4°C or 0.3°C or less since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the

optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. It would have been further obvious in order to provide more control in the deterioration of the optical signal characteristics.

13. Considering **claims 4-7 and 9-10**, the modified method of Ohira discloses (paragraphs 45-55) the temperature change of ($\pm 2.5^{\circ}\text{C}$) during the measurement of the DMB of the optical fiber is based upon a set time but fails to specifically disclose the predetermined range is calculated such that the temperature change of the ambient environment is controlled to $\pm 1.0^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{hour}$ or less ($\pm 5.0^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{hour}$ or less, claim 10) and the measurement time is not more than 10 minutes (3 minutes, claim 6) (5 minutes, claim 9).

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the predetermined range is calculated such that the temperature change of the ambient environment is controlled to $\pm 1.0^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{hour}$ or $\pm 5.0^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{hour}$ or less and the measurement time is not more than 3, 5 or 10 minutes, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. It would have been further obvious in order to provide more control in the deterioration of the optical signal characteristics.

14. Considering **claim 8**, the modified method of Ohira fails to specifically disclose prior to the measurement time of the DMD of the optical fiber, placing the optical fiber in a measurement environment until the temperature of the optical fiber substantially equals a temperature of the measurement environment.

However this would have been well known in the art to calibrate the temperature of the object to be measured before any measurements are performed since it will create a standard of measurement for all future measurements.

Therefore, it would have been further obvious in order to provide more accurate results.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tara S. Pajoohi whose telephone number is (571)272-9785. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tarifur R. Chowdhury can be reached on 571-272-2287. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tara S Pajoohi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2886

/TARIFUR R CHOWDHURY/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2886